SOCIOLOGICAL NOTES.

Swedish Tobacco and Glass Industries.[1]—Two reports on labor statistics are reviewed in the "*Ekonomisk Tidskrift*" (Häft. 12, 1899). It is hard to disengage many facts from these reviews owing to their markedly polemic character. The strife is, in brief, the following: K. Key-Åberg insists on a uniform, condensed series of question-formulæ (concerning the "chief points"—trade-specialty, sex, age, civil position and remuneration) and wishes results to be stated separately for each laborer, while his critic finds fault with this method and with the work of its exponent. Several interesting facts are recorded, however, especially with regard to the tobacco industry.

The first Swedish tobacco industry was founded in Stockholm in 1660; it prospered under the peaceful reign of Karl XI., but declined in the warlike period immediately following. Under the *régime* of protection it again thrived, and in 1741 there were thirty-three tobacco establishments, employing 1,338 laborers and putting forth a product valued at $253,800. This was not, however, a permanent prosperity, and we find the industry affording the following figures in 1780: Establishments, 72; laborers, 753; value of production, $178,200.

In the present century prosperity has been unbroken; the manufacture of cigars has contributed largely to this result. In the seventeenth century only pipe and chewing tobacco were produced; snuff came in during the eighteenth century, and even in 1897, 9,680,000 pounds of snuff were manufactured. Cigars were first manufactured in 1814, and were at the outset unpopular; in 1897, however, one hundred and thirty-one million cigars were made, an average of twenty-six per head of population. Besides this twenty-six million were imported.

In 1897 there were ninety-three large tobacco manufactories, employing 4,380 hands with an output worth $4,050,000. The largest industries are located in the three largest cities, Stockholm, Göteborg and Malmö. About 2,200,000 pounds of tobacco are raised in Sweden, three or four times this amount of the raw product being imported.

Of the laborers employed in the industry, 63 per cent are women and 22 per cent under eighteen years of age. In 1874 the percentage of the under-aged was 37, but after the royal decree of 1881 it declined to 18.5 in 1885. Since then the figure has risen to 21.5 per cent in 1890 and 22.5 per cent in 1897; in 1898, however,

[1] Contributed by Dr. A. G. Keller, Yale University.

there was found no laborer under twelve years of age. Labor is not mobile; 67.3 per cent of the men and 72.2 per cent of the women work in their native districts; ¼ of the men and ⅙ of the women have worked over ten years with the same employer. Only 9.8 per cent of the men and 5.3 per cent of the women follow the paternal trade.

Of the grown men 39.6 per cent and of the grown women 71.2 per cent are unmarried; 16 per cent of the unmarried women report themselves mothers. Temperance societies and similar moral movements are not popular among the workmen in this industry, but trades unions recruit here some of their most faithful supporters.

The average labor-day is 9.5 hours, which is not regarded as oppressive. Reported statistics of wages are derived in large part from employers' books. The following table of yearly wages is given:

	Married men.	Unmarried men.	Married women.	Unmarried women.
Cigarmakers	$242.46	$189.81	$179.55	$155.33
Sorters and Packers .	274,86	227.61	199.53	172.26
Cigarette makers (?)		63.18	151.47	143.37
Wrapper makers . . .	186.30	121.23	169.83	101.79
Spinners and Rollers .	273.24	201.96	. . .	115.02
Pressers	196.02	141.75	95.85	. . .
Snuffmakers	220.59	152.28	. . .	. . .

These rates of wages seem rather low, especially the wage of the cigarmakers; such a rate of remuneration perhaps explains the large number of the unmarried, as well as the small percentage of those who follow the paternal trade. Other factors combine to render the industry in question repellent to the laborer; among these are the unwholesome and uncomfortable localities of tobacco factories and prevalent illness. In the period, 1893–97, 51.6 per cent (forty-eight cases) of death were due to affections of the respiratory organs.

A few figures having to do with the glass industry may be compared with the above; the writer of this review is too intent on discrediting Key-Åberg to give anything like a luminous summary.

In the period, 1831–35, 28.2 per cent under-aged labor was employed, the age-limit being fifteen years; in 1896–98, 28.7 per cent, the age limit having been eighteen since 1862. The maximum figure for such employment was 32 per cent (1876–80), the minimum 24.1 per cent (1881–5). The royal decree on this subject came into action June 1, 1882. Fifty-two establishments are cited in the present work, of which twenty-five are in the province of Kronoberg.

The following table is reproduced, but since it comprises only six establishments, and these the largest, some modifications are to be

made before the conclusions would apply to the whole glass industry of the kingdom:

	Average No. workmen, 1898.	Workmen questioned, 1898.	Per cent.	Value of output per laborer, 1898.
Surte	453	182	40.2	$447.02
Kosta	452	163	35.8	358.41
Reymyra	371	185	49.9	270.68
Liljedahl	300	252	84.0	392.72
Glafva	225	152	67.6	600.00
Sölje	39	35	89.7	432.00
Total	1,840	969	52.7	399.21

Employers' Liability.—The report of Commissioner McMackin, of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of New York for 1899—the advance sheets of which were issued February 5, 1900—deals at some length with the question of liability of employers. Inasmuch as New York is one of the states that has not yet passed any statutory law on this subject, the review of the situation in New York and elsewhere which Commissioner McMackin gives may prove of interest to those studying the question of Employers' Liability in the United States. Commissioner McMackin says:

"In this state the liability of employers to pay civil damages to injured employes rests purely upon judge-made law, no statute up to the present time having been enacted by the legislature. The source of the present law must therefore be sought in the English common-law and the precedents established by English and American courts. While the essential principles of the law have been invested with a mass of detail and legal subtleties, they are in reality very simple. They are deducible from two maxims of the common law: (1) A person is liable for his own wrong-doing and breaches of contract. Hence 'a person guilty of negligence is liable to make compensation for pecuniary damages therefrom, if the damage is legally traceable to the negligence.' (2) A principal is responsible for the acts of his agents; a master for those of his servants; an employer for those of his employes, while they are performing his work and acting within the scope of their authority. *Respondeat superior*, 'Let the master answer.'

"Had these two simple principles of the common law been logically applied, there would not have arisen so universal and powerful a demand for legislation to make effective the responsibility of employers to their workmen. Unfortunately, the common law rule of *Respondeat*

superior has been abrogated by the judge-made law that an employer is not responsible for the negligence of his agent or employes, provided the person injured is also in his service. A perfect stranger is entitled to recover damages from the employer for injuries brought upon him by any of the latter's employes; not so, one of his own employes. This is the famous *doctrine of common employment*, established in the English courts in 1837 and since followed as a precedent by the courts of the United States as well as those of England. Its harshest application appeared in the case of railway accidents, wherein any passenger injured could sue the company for damages, but a clerk employed by the company in its offices and traveling on the same train would have had no cause of action, since the accident was caused not by the corporation itself but by one of its servants, *i. e.*, a fellow-employe of the clerk.

"The doctrine of common employment rests on the false assumption that the workman, upon taking employment, voluntarily assumes the ordinary and familiar risks of the occupation, including accidental injuries caused through the negligence of his fellow workmen. The assumption of the risk has been regarded as an implied part of his contract with the employer, and it has been argued that his wages covered payment for the hazard of accident. The argument is a plausible one, but it proves too much. If the workman is judged to assume the risks of occupation simply because he is aware of the existence of such dangers, a third person injured under the same circumstances with the workman should have no standing in court. Railway passengers are aware of the risks of accident to which they subject themselves when traveling, yet they are not permitted to relieve the transportation company of liability by any contract, express or implied.

"Whatever the reasonableness and justice of the doctrine of common employment in a primitive agricultural community, it is clearly out of place in an industrial society where work is carried on in great shops and factories with the aid of complicated machinery. It is absurd to hold a cotton spinner responsible for an act of the distant engineer which causes an injury to the former. Hence the universal demand for the abolition of the doctrine by statute, a demand which was first satisfied by Germany nearly a generation ago (1871). England partially abrogated the doctrine in 1880 and replaced it with entirely new methods of enforcing employers' responsibility in 1897. Throughout Europe the doctrine long since lost all defenders, but in this country it still persists with the exception of a few of the states. Alabama followed England in 1885 and Massachusetts in 1887, and a few other states have also restricted its application by statute. Else-

where it has been limited by the courts, as has been done in New York; and yet within the past year a case was decided in one of the appellate divisions of the Supreme Court which virtually pronounced a car dispatcher on an electric street railway to be a fellow servant of a motorman who was injured while carrying out the dispatcher's orders.

"*Breakdown of Liability Laws.* The abolition of the doctrine of common employment appears at first sight a simple and adequate remedy for the establishment of the responsibility of employers in cases of accidental injury to workmen. It was so thought by the workingmen of Europe until an experience of from ten to twenty years convinced them of the utter failure of employers' liability laws to secure justice. In order to obtain a verdict for damages the workman is obliged to break down a host of defences set up by clever attorneys. He must prove, first of all, that he himself exercised the utmost care, else he will be adjudged guilty of 'contributory negligence' and his case dismissed. He must prove that he was carrying out orders of his superiors; that he was engaged at work within his own employment; that machinery was defective. Finally, after he has given legal proof of these and other technical facts, he must show that he gave notice to his employer of any defect in the machinery that may have contributed to the injury. If he was aware of any defect, and failed to make complaint, he thereby 'acquiesced' in the situation and had no legal remedy. The element of uncertainty is therefore of great importance even with the best of employers' liability laws, and deters scores of workmen from attempting to secure a just compensation. Other deterrents are the heavy expenses of litigation and the absolute certainty of losing employment. The British Royal Commission on Labor clearly pointed out that 'when a workman goes to law with his employer he, as it were, declares war against the person on whom his future probably depends. The broad result is that a legal claim for damages only answers when the injury is very great and a workman is prepared to leave his master's service.'

"On the other hand, the liability laws were only a little less distasteful and unsatisfactory to the employers, who were often put to enormous expense to defend themselves against the legal attacks of professional "accident" attorneys. The money that fair-minded employers would willingly have paid to an injured employe in the way of compensation, they saw absorbed in the costly processes of litigation.

"The whole difficulty lay in the impossibility of locating the blame for an accident, as the principle of liability laws requires. When an accident occurs in a modern factory or railway, the fault can seldom be traced to a single person. This was well demonstrated in a Ger-

man investigation of 15,970 accidents in 1887, the figures of which, frequently quoted, still bear repetition:

	Per cent of total.
Fault of the employer	19.76
Fault of the injured	25.64
Fault of both	4.45
Fault of a third person, particularly a co-employe,	3.28
No fault which can be assigned	3.47
Inevitable risk when at work	43.40
	100.00

"This table sets in clear light the whole case against employers' liability laws from the standpoint of the worker. Even with full legal proof he cannot obtain compensation in 20 per cent of the cases of injury; and it is comparatively seldom that he can secure legal proofs. In more than 50 per cent of the accidents, the fault was neither the workman's nor the employer's; the accident was due to the inherent risks of the occupation.

"In order, therefore, to do away with the heavy expenditures for litigation, which benefit no useful class in society, to secure adequate compensation for every accidental injury during work, and to replace hostility between employer and employed with industrial peace, both employer and workman in the great European countries joined in promoting legislation which gave to every workman, injured while at his occupation, the right to a stipulated compensation *without recourse to law.*

"*Workmen's Compensation Acts.* The underlying principle of these Workmen's Compensation Acts, as they are called, is the demonstrated fact that most accidents are an incident of the industry, rather than the fault of individuals. Laws for the prevention of accidents have accomplished so little, principally because a vast number of accidents is positively inevitable under the pressure of competition. When a workman, in order to save time, risks his fingers too near a circular saw and eventually receives a bad cut, it is idle to reproach him with his own carelessness. He was saving time *for his employer* and taking the risk in his employer's service. The hazard of accident is to be treated in precisely the same manner as progressive business men have treated the danger of fire, *i. e.*, to be insured against and the cost of insurance charged against the expense account. It thus becomes a charge upon the industry and is eventually paid by the community as consumers. In some countries accident insurance is compulsory, the purpose being the prevention of losses to injured workmen whose employers become insolvent.

"Germany was the first country to recognize both the injustice and the wastefulness of employers' liability laws, which cause a large expenditure of money for litigation alone, and to substitute therefor workmen's compensation acts, designed to abolish litigation, to provide compensation for every accidental injury not due to the victim's own misconduct, and to fix the charges upon the industry. The date of the enactment of the German law was July 6, 1884. Austria followed, December 28, 1887, and Norway, July 23, 1894. England, after long years of agitation for the reform of the Employers' Liability Act of 1880, finally accepted the principle of compensation and enacted the Workmen's Compensation Act of August 6, 1897, which went into effect July 1, 1898. England's decisive action brought to a head the sentiment in favor of compensation acts in the countries of continental Europe, and within a short time the legislatures of Denmark, Italy, France and Switzerland fell into line, and nearly every other country in Europe has undertaken investigations preliminary to parliamentary action. That the American states will sooner or later follow along the same path of social legislation is scarcely to be doubted."

Fourth Congress of the International Institute of Sociology.—The International Institute of Sociology will hold its fourth congress at Paris during the closing days of next September. Two questions or main topics will be taken up—first, "The Problem of the Clan," second, "Historical Materialism." A large number of eminent sociologists are expected to be in Europe and will be invited to take part in this congress. Other questions and topics may be taken up with the consent of the executive committee of the congress. Among the speakers already announced is Dr. Lester F. Ward, of Washington, who will present a paper on "Social Mechanics." A more complete announcement may be expected in the near future. The secretary of the International Institute is Monsieur René Worms, and his address is 35 rue Quincampoix, Paris, France.

Careers of College-bred Negroes.—Atlanta University, which has conducted so many valuable investigations under the direction of Professor W. E. Burghardt DuBois, has sent out a very complete schedule of questions to over twelve hundred negro college men, making an inquiry concerning their present occupation, the things they have been engaged in since leaving college, and the measure of success and the lines along which successful effort has been made by these college men. The last report dealt with business undertakings among negroes, and this one will doubtless supplement those of past years in a way that promises to throw light on the vexed questions relating to the education of the negro.

Labor Legislation in New York.—The recommendations of Governor Roosevelt in his Annual Message, January 1, 1900, on Labor Questions and Tenement House Reform are especially interesting as indicative of a desire to encourage progressive legislation. He says:

"I call the attention of the legislature to the reports of the State Board of Mediation and Arbitration, of the Commissioner of Labor Statistics and of the State Factory Inspector. During the past year very valuable labor measures have been enacted into laws, and they are well enforced. I am happy to say that in speaking of labor legislation I can talk mainly of performance—not of promise. Additional legislation will undoubtedly from time to time become necessary; but many vitally needed laws have already been put upon the statute books. As experience shows their defects, these will be remedied. A stringent eight hour labor law has been enacted. This is working well as a whole.

"In nothing do we need to exercise cooler judgment than in labor legislation. Such legislation is absolutely necessary, alike from the humanitarian and the industrial standpoints; and it is as much our duty to protect the weaker wage workers from oppression as to protect helpless investors from fraud. But we must beware above all things of that injudicious and ill-considered benevolence which usually in the long run defeats its own ends. To discourage industry and thrift ultimately amounts to putting a premium on poverty and shiftlessness. It is neither of benefit to the individual nor to society needlessly to handicap superior ability and energy, and to reduce their possessor to the level of work and gain suited for his less able and energetic rivals.

"There have been a large number of strikes for increase of wages during the past year. The fact that these strikes were not against a reduction, but for an increase, is due to the prosperous condition of the country and state generally. The services of the present excellent Board of Mediation and Arbitration have been in almost constant demand, and they have been gratifyingly successful. The number of controversies amicably adjusted directly and indirectly through its influence, has been greater than that during any year since its creation. The work of mediation—that is, of settling the dispute before it has reached an acute stage—is even more important and successful than that of arbitration proper, after the strike is once on. This being so, it would be well to enact legislation which would compel parties to labor disputes to notify the board of impending trouble, or of strikes and lockouts.

"The experiment of publishing a quarterly bulletin by the Bureau of Labor Statistics has worked excellently and the bulletin should be

continued and improved. I suggest that it would be well to define by statute the questions that may legally be asked of manufacturers by this bureau. Abuses have occurred in connection with the employment offices in the larger cities, which are now allowed to violate the law with impunity, the power of punishment lying with the local authorities. It would be well to require the keeper of any employment office to procure a license from the state, as in Minnesota and other states. This license should be granted on the payment of a substantial fee, and the business would thus be restricted to responsible parties and kept under the control of the state administration.

"The measures suggested in my message of last year and carried into effect by legislation, increasing the number of factory inspectors, and requiring a license for all shops and rooms where garments are made for general employers, have already greatly increased the efficiency of the Factory Inspector's Department, and enlarged its service to the public. Too little time has elapsed since the sweatshop law went into effect, in September, to give a full report of its benefits. As illustrating its efficiency in interfering with sweatshops I may mention that so far under its provisions 4,942 licenses have been granted and 918 refused. These 918 cases represent the sweatshops which would now have been in operation save for this law and for the way it has been enforced.

"I shall not ask for any increase of the number of salaried inspectors this year, but I recommend that the power be given to the Governor and to the Factory Inspector to name, whenever necessary, unsalaried inspectors to undertake special investigation or aid the department at special times. Such assistance would increase the efficiency of the work of the department without imposing added burdens upon the state.

"I urge that the legislature give particular attention to the need of reform in the laws governing the tenement houses. The Tenement House Commission of 1894 declared that, in its opinion, the Tenement House Laws needed to be revised as often as once in five years, and I am confident that the improvements in building materials and construction of tenements, and the advance in sanitary legislation all demand further modification of existing laws. Probably the best course to follow would be to appoint a commission to present a revised code of Tenement House Laws."

Lynching and the Franchise Rights of the Negro.—The Rev. Edgar G. Murphy, the Secretary of the Southern Society, which holds a Conference on Race Problems at Montgomery, Ala., in May, in a recent address delivered in Philadelphia, upon the joint invita-

tion of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, the American Society for the Extension of University Teaching and the Civic Club of Philadelphia, spoke very clearly on both the subject of lynching and the franchise question. His opinions are significant as those of a young and progressive Southern man who is definitely committed to an active policy until some settlement of the race difficulties in the South is reached. The following is a quotation from his recent address now published in pamphlet form:

"Of the lynching problem I shall hardly pause to speak. It is only the sensational aspect of difficulties more essential and more significant. There has been less lynching at the South this year than ever before. The excuseless atrocity of certain lawless penalties has shown that the mob is in the hands to-day of a lower element than it could once enlist. The presence of a few strong men at the ordinary lynching, served, a few years ago, to secure some semblance of decency and order. They were the restraining element, and that element is now withdrawn. The very madness of the mob reveals the desertion of those whose presence gave it the only weight it ever had with the better people of the South. The whole method is being rejected by its only influential and responsible advocates. Lynching is becoming, in most instances, but the device of the unthinking; and it is doomed. It has given the criminal the crown of a pseudo-martyrdom among the very race it was intended to warn; it has given to the real victim the double martyrdom of a needless publicity; through the power of criminal suggestion it has multiplied the crimes it has attempted to check, so that it conserves neither the majesty of the law nor the security of the home.

"The general problem of the Negro's legal rights—his rights before the Southern jury and before the average court, presents our subject, however, under one of its darkest aspects. It is hard for the Negro to get justice. The evil is not easy of remedy, but Southern men are working upon it, and Southern men themselves will right it, in so far as it can be righted. I need hardly tell you that this evil is not peculiar to the South. As Professor W. F. Willcox, of Cornell—chief statistician in the census office and a Northern man—has indicated in a recent paper upon Negro Criminality, there are more convictions of Negroes for crime at the North, in proportion to the number of the Negro population, than at the South. The result is due, I think, not only to the Negro's weaknesses, but to the popular prejudice, everywhere, against an inferior race. It is due to the presence in the jury box of the very element which feels the deepest racial antipathies; for it is as hard in the South to get a jury—especially in connection with petty cases—which will really represent the conscience, culture

and life of the community, as it is in the North. I know of scores of attorneys who are giving of their interest and time to the service of Negroes, without thought of remuneration, and they tell me, strange as it may seem to you, that the juror in the South to-day who is most just to the Negro at the bar is the slave owner of a former time. The Negro meets his hardest and most unreasonable penalties at the hands of the later class of workaday people, who, coming to judgment in this hour, are like that prince in the kingdom long ago who knew not Joseph. Moreover, the cause of justice to the Negro is usually safe in the hands of those who have really known him. The people of the old régime, with their direct descendants, usually represent the gentler classes, the Patrician element, in Southern life. Justice at the South is secure, as it is secure everywhere, just in so far as the surface frictions of class and caste and race are met by the sweetening and healing forces of experience, education and religion."

On the questions of the suffrage we note the following:

"When we touch the problem of political privilege in relation to the Negro, we open up the questions that most deeply divide the opinions of Southern men. Never, to any people, has there been proposed a problem so terrible in all the alternatives which it presents. The subject, studied not in its theoretic bearings, but in relation to the facts, is bewildering in the complexity of its embarrassments. Not long ago, in conversation with one of the wisest leaders whom the Negroes to-day possess, I asked him this question: 'My friend, suppose this problem were left frankly and absolutely in your hands for you yourself to solve—what would you do with it?' Turning to me, he said with the greatest deliberation: 'Mr. Murphy, if I had the power to secure again the conditions of the reconstruction period—every Negro in my county with the ballot—every Negro casting his ballot—I would shrink from the consequences it would involve. I could not so decide.' Every man who knows the actual working conditions of the Southern county where the white voters are outnumbered by the Negroes six to one, knows also that the welfare of the Negroes themselves is contingent upon the supremacy of the forces of intelligence and property. It is simply a question of the preservation of those very economic and social conditions upon which, at the last, the Negro himself is dependent for his light and leading and welfare. . . .

"As to the internal policy of the state itself toward the problem of Negro suffrage, I think Southern men are feeling the need, increasingly, for a limitation of the franchise by an educational and property test. There are multitudes of us, however, who feel that this test—in justice to the welfare of the state, and in justice to the white man, even more than in justice to the Negro, should apply to

the shiftless and the illiterate of both races. Under the provisions of the Fifteenth Amendment, such a test cannot technically be offered to the one element of the population without being offered to the other. But, through the introduction of "understanding clauses" and through other subterfuges of legislation, such discretionary power is given to the judges of election, in the states which have adopted it, that the test in its enforcement bears chiefly upon the Negroes. Such a provision—as in the case of Williams *v.* The State of Mississippi—has been sustained in law by the Supreme Court of the United States, but in its application it carries with it all the moral odium of the practice of deceit and force. It is attended with the same heavy burdens, to the consciences of both the oppressor and the oppressed as the more open employment of violence and wrong.

"Southern sentiment will not approve the disfranchisement of the illiterate Confederate soldier. In any civilization, there is a deep and rightful regard for the man who has fought in the armies of the state. But, with that exception, the state must eventually protect itself, and protect the interests of both races, by the just application of the suffrage-test to the whites and the blacks alike. The soldier element in Southern life is rapidly passing away through the ravages of suffering and age and death. When the question then comes before the South strictly upon its merits, I have full faith in the answer which the South will give. The South must, of course, secure the supremacy of intelligence and property. . . .

" . . . How are we to secure this solution? How may we obtain the legal and working expression of this idea of *justice for both races?* I answer—perhaps to your surprise, but altogether without hesitation —through, and only through, the partial modification of the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. That provision has made the cause of the Negro's civic rights the cause of the federal authority, and has thus operated to weaken and in part to destroy that sense of local responsibility which is, practically, and in the last analysis, the sole arbiter of his political fortunes. I do not suggest its reversal in such a sense as would in terms destroy that potential citizenship of the Negro to which I have referred, but I do suggest such a modification of the amendment as may make the question of the definite conditions of the franchise a local issue in every state of the union. Such a proposal, as men to-day forget, bears the seal of the consummate statesmanship of Mr. Lincoln himself,

"The franchise is in fact a local issue. The Fifteenth Amendment is inoperative to-day except as an irritation. It does not enfranchise where the public sentiment of the state disfranchises. It does not

give any man a vote to whom the local sense of the public welfare refuses the privilege of the ballot. It is a dead letter in the organic law of the country. The 'understanding' clauses and the 'grandfather' provisions of the state law are already adequate to annul its intended influence and to limit the Negro vote wherever that vote, through the overwhelming numbers of an illiterate and shiftless electorate, would involve the county or the state in social, civic and commercial ruin. I do not believe in legislative subterfuges, but the legislative subterfuge represents a higher morality than the dominion of a brutal and irresponsible illiteracy. The dominant party of the reconstruction period, rejecting the saner counsels of Mr. Lincoln, made us try the latter method, and its memories have burned to the very bone. The Fifteenth Amendment broke down at the South under the odium of its military enforcement. You here—our friends and brothers and fellow-helpers of the North—would be the last to see the experiment repeated. Unless, then, the national government is prepared so to enforce it, we are thrown forward inevitably upon the conclusion that for its practical applications the Fifteenth Amendment is dependent upon local sentiment, and that the franchise is in fact a local issue."